

JOURNAL

OF THE

ASIATIC SOCIETY.

*Points in the History of the Greek, and Indo-Scythian Kings in Bactria, Cabul, and India, as illustrated by decyphering the ancient legends on their coins. By CHRISTIAN LASSEN, Bonn, 1838.*¹

Character of the Alphabet.

The rule for reading the Alphabet is the Semitic, and this fact is the more remarkable, as the Indian characters of the immediate neighbourhood, as well as those occurring upon Greek coins, coeval with the most ancient coins on which the Cabulian characters occur, have never assumed this direction in all the varieties which the Indian alphabet has gone through within India and out of its confines.

The arrow-headed inscriptions too have the same direction with the Indian, and though at least one variety of them does not express the a, following consonants, yet it has not, as the characters of the coins have, signs of the shortened vowels i and u.

On the other hand, there is evidently in the legends a certain approximation to the Indian system of vowel-writing, not especially by the fact, that i and perhaps also u, even when short, are not denoted by marks on the consonants, nor by the other similarity, that they are not represented, even when long (with u however this is mere conjecture) by the corresponding quiescent semivowels j and v; for the first may occur in

¹ Continued from p. 488. vol. ix.

Semitic alphabets, the latter may be omitted in them, especially if they be applied to a foreign language ; but this approximation of the vowel system is made remarkable by the peculiarity, that a is not treated in the same manner with i, but is considered inherent as in Indian languages. Whenever any Semitic language expresses the short vowels by smaller signs, it does so with a as well as with i and u : whenever it denotes the long vowels by quiescent consonants, similar to vowels, it applies for this purpose $\aleph$ as well as $\imath$ and $\beth$. But all Indian alphabets represent, as our coins do, A, I, U, by their own signs only as initials to syllables, but never A, when following a consonant, and the other vowels only by abbreviations.

The diphthongs, at least ô, do not follow the Indian system, according to which $\text{ते ते } te, tai, \text{तो, } to$, as well as $\text{तु } tu$, are written by abbreviated signs, they do not follow a Semitic system ; but the diphthongs are placed in the line with the other letters, and ô has in the writing no reference to u ; ê has it not to ee ; while instances of the uncontracted diphthongs *ái* and *áu* are wanting. The instance of Eukratides can decide nothing as to the system of orthography peculiar to the language.

As the diphthongs are written in this language, so were all the vowels in Zend ; but that language distinguishes between long and short vowels, though the former are but amplifications of the latter.

Now supposing that the characters on the coins were a Semitic alphabet applied to an Indo-Iranian dialect, the shapes of the consonants, and the initial vowels, might be considered as of Semitic origin, the principle for the medial vowels would have been borrowed from the Indian system of orthography, while an independent principle was invented for the diphthongs ; and if the orthography of the Zendic language were likewise of Semitic origin, the principle adopted on the legends for only ô, (and ê) would have been extended in this language to all vowels.

This conjecture embraces the postulate, that at the period when the characters on the coins were introduced, the Indian alphabet had already completed the system upon which its peculiar mode of representing the vowels is founded.

This supposition may, I think, be proved correct.

Let us first of all dismiss any consideration of the Semitic origin of both alphabets, and look to the reference they have one to another. If in the one, the system of vowels be of Indian origin, and in the other original (and peculiar to the language,) as above supposed, there can be no point of comparison. But with regard to the diphthong ô, it is worth remarking, that P, ô, has the form Ɔ on later coins, but slightly differing from Ƴ, and hence it would appear as if the Zendic alphabet had borrowed this ô from the alphabet on the coins. This, however, does not hold good with ê.

By comparing the consonants, we find resemblances perhaps only between r and w, (not v, of the Zend alphabet), and n, in which, however, the similarity is very obvious, though we in fact are comparing two extreme points only, viz. the characters on the coins in their most ancient form, and the Zendic character of wholly modern manuscripts. With other letters we only require a common medium of comparison to ascertain their relation, as for instance with m, dh, and others.

I do not propose to carry this comparison further, which to afford satisfactory evidence, would require us to obtain in the first instance the characters of the coins in their latest shapes; and would also necessitate us to point out in the Zendic alphabet, what characters were subjected to a change of shape, to which the nasals are especially liable. Lastly, it would not be sufficient to confine our comparison to these two alphabets; all other alphabets must be similarly considered, which in a geographical and historical point of view are included in the same circle as these, viz. the Pehlvi characters of the books of the Parsees, so intimately connected with the Zendic character, as well as the various characters of the Sassanian monuments. All of them are closely connected, first, in a geographical point of view, as they are the native tongues in the countries west of the Indus, and east of the Euphrates, viz., in Iran, probably so called; and secondly, in an historical point of view, as they came into use in the period intervening between Alexander the Great and the invasion of the Mahomedans.

Without at all deciding on the time when the Zendic

works were first composed, it is certainly evident, that the characters of the coins, appearing before the dominion of the Sassanians, were the most ancient of the alphabets of Central Iran.

The characters on the coins are therefore of special importance with regard to their relations to Semitic alphabets, before proposed as a mere conjecture, and if we do consider that it was during the dominion of the Seleucides, and their successors, in use in Bactria and Parthia, we must look for the model upon which they are formed, in the capitals of the Seleucidian power, if their origin from the west be admitted. The comparison must consequently specially include all that may be most likely to afford us an idea of the Syrian alphabet, as it was in use under the Seleucides, such as the inscriptions of Palmyra, though the most ancient of them is nearly a century and a half later than the characters on the coins.

These conjectures pretend to no more authority than is implied in them as mere suggestions, and they must not hinder us from determining more exactly the alphabet on the coins in a geographical and chronological point of view.

Its geographical limits are connected with the extent of the Greco-Bactrian and Indo-Scythian power southward from the Indian Caucasus. None of the Greek kings who reigned in Bactria only has made use of this alphabet on his coins, and even of those who have adopted them, *Eukratides* perhaps alone possessed territories in Bactria, as well as southward from the Caucasus.

To this we must add the following : the Kanerkis, who, while passing towards India, must have lingered longer in Bactria than other Scythians, because they appropriated to themselves in preference Bactro-Persian gods, have, like the Greek purely Bactrian kings, never adopted this alphabet.

This being so, we cannot help supposing, that the characters of the coins were not indigenous to Bactria, that is to say, that they existed to the south only, and not to the north of the Caucasus.*

* A short inscription, a word from Bamian, which Mr. Masson had read according to their alphabet, is quite uncertain, *As. T.* v. 188.

They are discovered to the east in topes, near Jelalabad, and between the Indus and Hydaspes in Manikyâla, but further eastward than this, they have not been met with. We also do not know yet whether they extend to Kandahar, in a more westerly direction. To the north of the Cabul river those characters are met with in Kapurdigarhi, in the ancient Peuke-laotis. As. Trans. v. Pl. xxviii.

As the matter therefore rests at present, we may assert, that these characters were geographically limited to the country about the Cabul river, and we will term the characters on the coins THE CABULIAN ALPHABET.

Menandros, or Eukratides, is the first who made use of the alphabet. That we may not pretend to fix the time more exactly than the facts admit, we shall assign their first occurrence to the years 180—170 (B. C.) It existed in use, as has been already noticed, till within the Sassanian era, and is therefore coeval with the character found further west on the monuments and coins of the Sassanides.

The latest occurrence of these characters is perhaps found in the report of Hiuan Thsang, when he says, that in *Thsaokiutho* other characters than the Indian were in use; now there, in the country to which our alphabet was indigenous, about the Panjhir, a tributary of the Cabul, it appears hardly possible to allude to any other characters than to these.

But it was, on the other hand, also cotemporary with the Indian alphabet, which appears as early upon the coins of Agathokles and Pantaleon, and proves entirely different, both by its opposite mode of writing and by the shape of its characters. This Indian alphabet occurs immediately before this date on the columns of Azôka (260—219. B. C.)* and continues under the Indian kings of the Maurja dynasty.† As now the empire of Azôka extended to the Indian Caucasus (I shall hereafter recur to this) and as it would appear preposterous that he should have introduced an alphabet foreign to him upon the *stupas* which he is said to have built there,‡ as on the contrary the

* Zeitschrift fuer die Kunde des Morgenlander, As. Trans. vi. 791.

† As. Trans. vi. 678.

‡ Foe K. p. 395.

Cabulian characters on the coins disappear in western India, together with the dominion of the foreigners, the following conclusions seem still to result. First, the Cabulian characters on the coins occur in the Punjab, not because a native alphabet was unknown there, but in consequence of the foreign dominion, which transplanted thither from Cabul, carried on its coins along with it, to the east, its peculiar characters. Secondly, it is doubtful, whether the dominion of the foreigners descending from the Caucasus, found in western Cabulistan, this alphabet alone in use, or employed in common with an Indian one. To us it appears probable, from the foregoing remarks, that these foreigners did not import the alphabet with them from Bactria. At the very place where the intercourse of trade brought into contact the east and the west, India and Iran, it was most easily possible that an alphabet, introduced from the west, such as we must admit the alphabet on the coins on our previous investigation to be, may have been in use in common with Indian letters, unless we be disposed to attribute to the Paropamisades the invention of an alphabet of their own. Whether there were indeed an Indian alphabet there, we shall not question; the coins of Agathokles and Pantaleon, however, prove, that an Indian alphabet, if not in western Cabulistan, prevailed at least more to the eastward; had this not been the case, why should they have used Indian characters? But these characters disappear with those kings, and retreat proportionately with the extension of the dominion of Menandros to the eastward.

I do not here extend these remarks, as the era and the abode of Agathokles and Pantaleon are still uncertain; I shall only add, that I can place them neither with Mr. Raoul-Rochette in Bactria at the head of all those princes, nor with Mr. K. O. Mueller remove them to India Proper.

But the following fact will prove, how correct it is to consider the characters on the coins as foreign to India. Upon the ancient Buddhist coins, discovered* in the ruins of the town Behat on the banks of the Jumna, there occurs the title 𑀧𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀓

* As. Trans. III. 227.

Mahārājō, in Cabulian characters, and on the reverse the same words in the old Indian characters of the Agathokles coins, and the Azōka columns.* By this fact it is quite evident, that the Cabulian alphabet on the coins was not in use in India Proper, and this at the period when the most ancient form of the Devanagari, which we as yet know, was still prevailing. Those Buddhist kings whom we otherwise do not know, must have employed the Cabulian characters only for the use of their subjects on the banks of the Indus.

It does not follow from the foregoing remarks, that the characters are not more ancient than the coins upon which they occur. If no coins were previously struck there, the characters could not indeed be used for numismatic purposes, but they would be in the transactions of other business. When Pânini (IV. I. 49) informs us, that by the affix *ani* to the word *Javana*, the writing peculiar to this nation *Javanani* यवनानां लिपिः यवनानी is represented, he perhaps points at the Cabulian alphabet. According to Indian tradition, Pânini is placed immediately before Chandragupta, (therefore during the reign of Alexander the Great); it is more certain, however, that his native country was the ancient Gandhara, where he would be certainly enabled to become familiar with the characters of the *Javanas* of that country.

I have taken it for granted in the course of the preceding remarks, that the Indians were already possessed of an alphabet of their own, at the period when the Greek kings first extended their dominion to the south of the Caucasus; some of my inferences are mainly founded upon this view.

* I owe this important fact to communications Mr. Prinsep made me by letter. The proper names are not yet read, as far as I know, upon the coins of this kind, with duplicate legends; those that are read, are only in old Indian characters and Indian. *As. Trans.* VI. 464. As those others are ancient, I presume, that on these very coins, monuments of the dynasty of the Buddhist Khanishka will be brought to light; for he must have reigned a short time before or after the commencement of our era; he ruled Gandhara, Kazmira, and the country Keenaputi 500 lis to the eastward from Vipâzâ, (*Foe K.* p. 381). This lies in the nearest neighbourhood of Behat, and the use of the two-fold characters for the same language is exactly suited to these countries.

But now I perceive, that an erudite person whose views must be of great weight with all those that have occupied themselves with his writings, draws from the newest inquiries into Indian coins, the conclusion, that the Indian alphabet is derived from the Grecian.

Mr. Prinsep in decyphering these Indian characters, written in a peculiar manner on the coins of Saurashtra, asserted, that the more ancient the Nagari, the more similar become the characters to the Grecian ones. Upon this he had grounded the conclusion,* that the most ancient Greek characters are but the Indian turned upside down.

Mr. Mueller, who did not of course require proof of the invalidity of this view, takes the converse of the assertion.† “If,” says he, “the relation of the ancient Nagari to the Greek alphabet is closer than can be explained by the common derivation of both from Phœnician language, we are forced into the conclusion, that the Greeks introduced this alphabet to the Indians, and that in consequence, the heaven-born alphabet of the Brahmins is not older than Alexander.”

Now this is no casual remark, such as sometimes occurs in a journal, and which we may put aside without notice, but it is, if not a view deliberately considered, still an opinion positively pronounced and hopefully cherished. He says (p. 249,) “We must, however, confess that our hopes as to the historical connexion between Indian and Grecian civilization, go far beyond this fact,” (that the Indians have borrowed their shapes of coins from the Indo-Scythians) “and extend over the whole history of art and letters.”

It is therefore a favourite opinion of this celebrated scholar, the correctness or incorrectness of which must be of vital importance in Indian antiquities. For if the Indians had no alphabet before Alexander, all the writings that we have hitherto considered the subject matter of as genuine sources for the knowledge of India from the most ancient days, were penned after Alexander’s time, or more correctly speaking, after the

* As. Trans. VI. p. 390.

† Goett. Gel. Anz. at other places, p. 252.

establishment of the dominion of the Bactrian kings in Cabul and on the Indus, as no sound critic can assign such an influence as consequent on Alexander's momentary sojourn in India.

Bayer had discovered from some Indian words, communicated to him, that a striking similarity obtained between the Greek and Indian numerals; hence he concluded, that the Indians had borrowed these words from the Greeks. The affinity was ingeniously discovered, while the inference not too bold, as he at the same time admitted, that the Indians possessed other and more ancient native numerals; none, however, will probably in our days earnestly undertake to refute Bayer's opinion; but in his time he could hardly draw any other conclusion from the reports at his disposal.

Mr. Mueller's conclusion, however, appears to me much bolder, and whatever species of criticism he may meet with from others, I for my part shall refute him in good earnest.

Supposing, there exists in very deed a similarity between the Greek and the Indian characters on the Saurashtra coins, as Mr. Prinsep has maintained; granting also, that they were imitated after Parthian and Indo-Scythian models, it will be asked, what inference can be hence derived? Certainly only this, that the characters on those coins are of Greek origin. Mr. Mueller* places a date to these coins, subsequent to the first century of our era; the age of the Indian alphabet cannot therefore be traced with certainty prior to this period.

Whether this similarity do exist, or not, is here wholly beside the question; I think it fallacious, but I shall here drop the subject.

Mr. Mueller will have it for granted, that the older the Indian characters are, according to his conjecture, the closer must be their similarity with the Greek.

Now he assigns himself the coins of Agathokles and Pantaleon to the year 200—160 B. C. Their coins, having exactly the same alphabet as employed but a short time before on Indian monuments, was undoubtedly the form, then adopted, of Brahminical Debnagari. This character has been now decyphered with full

* p. 248.

authenticity by Mr. Prinsep, as is the most ancient from the Indian characters hitherto discovered.

I shall here copy this alphabet, (and ask), whether the hopes, above alluded to, of tracing the sources of the Indian alphabet to the Greek, are likely to be much favoured by this discovery? I must strongly doubt it.

𑀀 a 𑀁 i 𑀂 L 𑀃 u 𑀄 𑀅 rī 𑀆 ê 𑀇 + 𑀈 k 𑀉 𑀊 kh 𑀋 𑀌 g
 𑀍 d k' 𑀎 𑀏 k'h 𑀐 𑀑 g' 𑀒 t' 𑀓 𑀔 t'h 𑀕 𑀖 d' 𑀗 𑀘 d'h
 𑀙 t 𑀚 𑀛 t'h 𑀜 𑀝 d 𑀞 𑀟 d' 𑀠 n 𑀡 p 𑀢 p'h 𑀣 b
 𑀤 b'h 𑀥 m 𑀦 j 𑀧 r 𑀨 l 𑀩 v 𑀪 s 𑀫 h

It may be added, that this alphabet had already the junctions of consonants, and the representative marks for shortened vowels, such as we find them to this day in the Indian orthography.

To prove the desired derivation of the Indian alphabet from the Greek, it will be necessary to point out, as existing between the era of Alexander the Great, and the grandson of Chandragupta, Azôka, a form of Indian characters, marking the progress of transition from the Greek alphabet to the Indian, above exhibited. Till this has been effected, we may be allowed to keep in store (as reserve artillery), the remaining arguments in favour of the originality of the Indian alphabet, which are to be discovered in the grammatical system, in the history of the language, in the substance of the inscriptions, and, lastly, in the reports of Megasthenes and Nearchos.

The time has been, when every invention of the human mind must have passed from the East into Greece; but the philologists of classic antiquity would like to establish the converse of this view on every subject. The hope of advancing science is most laudable, but most fallacious, if cherished for a favourite system, since it impedes the judgment in forming clear and impartial conclusions. How otherwise could a man of so clear a mind, as is Mr. Mueller, fail to perceive, that he clung to a predilection, while neglecting the most important facts?

It seems to me, I confess, a pleasant accident, that this latest effort at Indian conquest, made by Greek philology, may be

refuted by the mere agency of a petty monument of Grecian art.

§ 13.

The Language.

That the language of the legends in the Cabulian character belongs to the widely extended family of the Arian languages, is so evident from the foregoing disquisition, as to render it unnecessary to dilate on the subject; a few words only on the latest coins of the Kadphises dynasty, constitute the only exception to this fact.

The language on the coins also remains at all periods unaltered; in the word *tádáró* alone is an alteration affected to *dhádháró*, giving evidence of a later variety in pronunciation.

I do not include in this assertion the language of the Kanerki-coins; they refer to another dialect, on the position of which, as to local use, a conjecture can only be formed hereafter. From the discussions, as to the country to which this alphabet was indigenous, the natural inference ensues, that the language, expressed in these letters, may be assigned to the same country; all peculiarities hitherto discovered, as to the system of sounds in the language, tend to the same conclusion.

The language is not Zend, for this does not absorb the consonants; the Zend has *puthra*, not *putta*, and retains even on the Kanerki-coins, *athro*, *mithro*, *ardethro*; the language of the coins, on the contrary, reads, *Minadhó*, *Eikatidó*; Zend again retains n before t, but not the language on the coins; Zend does not exclusively express its nominative in the termination *ô*, and it alters an Indian H into Z, while the language of the coins has *maható*. Zend has no L, while with our language it is a favourite letter, as for instance, *prati* becomes *pati*, and even *pali*. A Zendic, or more correctly speaking, an Iranian affinity, appears only in the substitution of k (i. e., q or kv) for *sp* identical with *sv*. This fact, and the correspondence with the old Persian in omitting the nasal before dentals, are the only peculiarities which refer to Iran.

Other facts have been noticed, with regard to the language, as common to the Indian dialects of Prâcrit, viz. the absorption

of consonants, the alteration of hard into soft roots, and the l for t. The word *Dharma* has a decided relation to India, being all a doctrinal term, which cannot be declared as such with reference to Iran; again, *râjan* for *king*, and *gaja* for *victory*; *tâdârô* too is also Indian,—though we will not deny its also belonging to Zend. These indications lead us to a country, immediately bordering upon India, and the language of which, though not entirely Indian, and rather forming a transitional dialect in some respects between the Indian and Iranian languages, still did not very materially differ from an Indian dialect; in saying which, I allude to the language in daily use with the common people, and not to Sanscrit, which was then already, in all probability, the language of the learned castes, and of the great. The existence of the dialects of Prâcrit, as in common use with the people, is ascertained by their occurrence on the Buddhist monuments of this time; the Prâcrit, or what eventually is the same, the Pali, could not have been raised by the Buddhists to the dignity of a religious language, unless it had existed aforetime among the people. Now as about the period of the first of the Greco-Indian kings, Prâcrit was used on monuments in India itself, at least by the Buddhists, there is no occasion for wonder, if we meet with a popular dialect in Cabulistan, especially on coins: the Sanscrit would have only been in use there under a Brahminical influence.

The country of the language on the coins may therefore with certainty, I think, be looked for westerly from the Indus, and to the south of the Indian Caucasus; but it is very difficult to define its limit more exactly; for though we have already proved, that the influence of Indian dialects extends to the westward of the Indus, even to the Cabul river beyond Jelalabad, still it does hence not follow, that to the country west of that, the same language existed. It is true, we found also, that the Paropamisades were represented as being Indians, and a later notice extends the term *Indian* even to Arachosia;* but reports of only a little later date, have limited the influence of the

* Isidor. Charac. with Huds. p. 8.

Indian language to a point beyond Jelalabad. To arrive at a conclusion, would involve the necessity of acquaintance with the more minute peculiarities of those languages in their ancient condition.

Again, the existing relics of the ancient languages in these countries, admit the inference of no deduction. The Deggani language in Lamghan, as well as the spoken language of Kaferistan, may still be recognised as remnants of old Indian dialects, but we do not know them so well, as to be able to make use of them here. The language of the remaining ancient races of western Cabulistan, the Kohistan of the present day, is entirely unknown. We can therefore only say generally, that in one of those dialects the remnants of the ancient Cabulian language must exist, the oldest traces of which occur on the coins, but without being able to decide ourselves in favour of any particular dialect among them, as being the receptacle of those remains. I indeed know, that some have pretended to recognise the Afghans in eastern Cabul, even as early as Alexander's time; not so Mr. Elphinstone,* who rather proves their immigration into Cabul at a much later period; this conjecture has originated with Professor Wilken, who thinks, he recognises the Afghans in the Assakanes.† If these were indeed Afghans, the Afghan language would have been spoken throughout Cabul, and the language of the coins must be the sources of the Pushtoo. Without observing, that neither ancient authorities nor modern Afghan history, admit or require this supposition, the correct assertion of the learned academician himself, that the Afghans belonged to the Medo-Persic tribe, is at variance with it; the Assakanes inhabited a country, where even in the 7th century A. D., an Indian language was spoken. The language of the Afghans, moreover, shows an evident difference from the language on the coins; as, for instance, it substitutes like Zend, *z* for the Indian *h*, *zummy*, winter, for *hima*, and this *z* is altered in the western Afghan dialect into *gh*, *urighu* (rice) for *urizu*, for *vrihi*.‡

* Account, &c. II, 10. 33. 44. 50. 56. &c.

† Abhandlg. der Berl. Acad. 1818-19 p. 261.

‡ "Ορϋζα has been introduced through Persian into Grecian language.

Though I cannot therefore discover the Afghans on the Indian frontier at so early a period, yet I willingly allow, that the original seats of the Afghans, may have had a situation sufficiently near Cabul. On this supposition, it would by no means be surprising, if their language were not a purely Iranian dialect, but rather like that on the coins, forming the transitional dialect between the Iranian and the Indian, but approaching (in point of locality), the west, with a prevailing affinity to Iranian peculiarities. I dare, however, not indulge myself by pursuing this interesting investigation.

§ 14.

The Kings. Classes of coins, and places of their discovery.

There is much more difficulty in obtaining for the seat of the different empires, established by the coins, and for the series of their kings, even that degree of probability, which we have, I think, succeeded in arriving at for both the language and alphabet.

It will here be necessary, first to have before us the materials to be arranged; I shall accordingly enumerate the names of the kings according to the coins, adding the facts, which hence result, as regard the æra, the succession, or any remarkable circumstance with respect to each of those kings. I have invariably noted the places, where the coins have been discovered, if it appeared to be instrumental in determining the native country of the kings. The classes I have adopted, are founded on the language and alphabet, and their sub-divisions upon the numismatic inquiries of Mr. Raoul-Rochette, and upon the titles of the kings.

Concerning this catalogue, I must premise, that it has been only made with a view to facilitate succeeding investigations, and that it does not pretend to giving a numismatic description.

I. *Coins with merely Greek characters.*

§ 1. *Greek characters, and purely Greek names and titles.*

Euthydemus. Head with diadem; on the reverse Hercules, either standing with the club raised in his left hand, the lion's skin over the arm, and in the right hand a crown, or else a common Hercules, seated, leaning on his left hand, in the right the

club placed on a rock.* The coins presenting Hercules in a standing position, exhibit the youthful head of the king, which indeed differs from the head of Euthydemos, as ordinarily represented, and rather resembles that of Agathokles; hence Mr. Raoul-Rochette's conjecture, that Euthydemos may have succeeded Agathokles, and may at first have retained on his coins the portrait of his predecessor.† The resemblance with that king, however, appears not striking enough, and the connexion between both of them could be only admitted in the reversed succession. Lastly, a coin has been discovered, the reverse of which represents a horse without trapping, and galloping;‡ one legend occurs invariably. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΕΥΘΥΔΗΜΟΥ. Bronze coins with an Apollo, crowned with laurel, and the reverse with the tripod. R. R. II. 60. J. d. S. p. 387.

We may get some single specimens of these coins, which are distinguished for their beauty, from the south of the Caucasus; but they come in course of trade from Balkh; there occur too in Bokhara many coins of Euthedemos, barbarously executed, with an almost illegible legend, which sometime eluded all attempts at reading it.§ These latter are imitations, originating with the Scythians of the north, whom we cannot call Indo-Scythians, as they had not arrived yet in India.

Demetrios, son of Euthydemos, a fact confirmed by the coins.||

Beardless, diademed head; reverse, helmeted Minerva, standing, with a long tunic, and a shorter one over it, the left hand leaning on the shield; in the right a spear. Another reverse with Hercules standing, either similar to the coins of the father,¶ or crowning himself with his right hand; and the head of the king, elegantly adorned with the trunk and tusks of an elephant. This latter emblem, evidently refers to his Indian conquests. Mr. Raoul-Rochette infers from the similarity of the other type with that on the coins of the Eukratides, that these

* R. R. J. des Sav. p. 328. p. 386. I. p. 7. A. T. IV. pl. XXV. No. 1. V. pl. XLVI. No. 3. † I. 8.

‡ As. T. V. pl. XLVI. No. 4. § R. R. I. 3. II. 12.

|| R. R. J. des Sav. p. 330. I. p. 3. II. 17.

¶ R. R. I. p. 7. &c. II. p. 16.

coins of Demetrios were struck, while he was unexpelled as yet from Bactria by Eukratides, and infers, that Demetrios had therefore also reigned in Bactria, though but for a short time.* That he laid claims to Bactria, is certain enough. These coins are likewise of superior workmanship, and in most elegant taste. Legend ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ. The coins are rare, and have been partly transmitted to us through India, partly through Bokhara. Their proper place of discovery is perhaps not yet exhausted (discovered?) On this hereafter. Mr. Mionnet (VIII. 473) pretends to infer from these coins the existence of two Demetrii; till this new fact in history is more surely proved, we may be allowed to treat this second Demetrios as "a king of shadows."

Heliokles.—Known only by his coins, and first embodied in the series of Bactrian kings by Mionnet, then by Visconti.† Mionnet asserted, that he was the son of (or of an) Eukratides, while Mr. R. R. thinks him his predecessor.‡ A specimen has been brought from the city of Cabul by Mr. Honigberger,§ Type; Jupiter standing, with the thunderbolt, and the legend ΗΛΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥ. On account of the epithet (*just*,) Mr. R. R. puts Heliokles in connexion with other kings, who likewise style themselves *just*,|| as the founder of a separate branch; but Lysias, whom he had in mind, in forming his opinion, is a Spalyrios, and of the other Grecian kings, only one has the same epithet, viz. Archelios, a later discovery, he has indeed as well the Jupiter type, but he in addition calls himself ΝΙΚΗΦΟΡΟΣ, and has a native legend. A copper coin of Heliokles, the first specimen of this kind, has been discovered of late in the Punjab, (As. Trans. Vol. VI. 987,) it is not stated, whether with a native legend or not. I may be hereafter allowed to propose a conjecture on historic grounds concerning his era.

Eukratides. Mr. Raoul-Rochette¶ distributes the coins bearing this name, between two Eukratides, father and son, on the precedent of Bayer, who maintained, that some things

* I. p. 10. As. T. IV. pl. XXV. No. 2.

† R. R. J. des Sav. 1834. p. 329.

‡ R. R. I. p. 34. II. p. 26.

§ R. R. I. 3.

|| I. p. 26.

¶ T. der Sav. p. 387.

were mentioned of Eukratides, not in correspondence with the victorious king of this name; hence he concluded, the name of his son, successor, and murderer, was the same.* But that the son and parricide did bear the same name, is not conclusively established by authorities (of which hereafter); while Mr. Mueller† objects to this view from the very reason, that, according to the arrangement of M. R. R., this very Eukratides, known to us as a parricide, was called “the Great.” There occur indeed two specimens, one of which has also native legends. I here describe the purely Greek one alone, postponing my own view for the historic examination.

Diademed head of the king; reverse, a naked Apollo crowned with laurel, standing with one hand leaning on a bow, in the other an arrow. Legend ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΕΥΚΡΑΤΙΔΟΥ.‡ This type never has a native legend. On other coins a head of Apollo with a laurel wreath; on the reverse, a horse with the same legend in Greek alone.§

The coins with the Dioscuri on horseback, with the title of “Great King,” and which are partly of purely Greek and some with a native legend, are assigned to Eukratides II.

This type of the Dioscuri, however, likewise occurs with the simple Greek legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΕΥΚΡΑΤΙΔΟΥ,|| and without the native character, which only appears, when the Greek has the word ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ. The Dioscuri on horseback have sometimes a helmeted, and sometimes a diademed head of the king; those with the caps of the Dioscuri only a diademed head, with the title either simple, or at length.¶

It is evident, that neither the difference between “king” and “Great King,” nor the native legend, affords any criterion for assigning the type of the Dioscuri to the son. There remains the difference in the features of the king, which may be laid to a difference in age. On the native legend we shall remark hereafter.

* p. 95.

† p. 205

‡ J. des Sav. p. 386, I. No. 5.

§ R. R. II. 60.

|| A. T. IV. pl. xxv. No. 6. 7.

¶ A. T. V. pl. xlvi. No. 10. No. 11.

Masson found 107 coins of Eukratides in Beghram, he does not, however, distinguish them according to the types.*

There occur also coins of Agathokles, with a purely Greek legend; but as nobody would adopt the idea of *two* Agathokles, we shall postpone the investigation of this point.

§ 2. *Purely Grecian characters, the kings not Greek, having, however, no barbarian titles.*

The following coins present a singular phenomenon. Mr. Masson discovered at Beghram,† in the space of three years two hundred and fifty-seven specimens of a coin with the legend ΒΑΣΙΛΣΕΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΣΩΤΗΡΜΕΓΑΣ, but without a proper name. The Greek legend being sometimes corrupted, we observe either ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥ or ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΩΝ.‡ Bags full of these may be had in Affghanistan, and in the Punjab. The similar coins with a native legend, never have the bust of the nameless king. Mr. Raoul-Rochette describes them in this manner: “Bust of a king, the head encircled by a diadem and a nimbus; with his left hand holding an iron spear; no legend. Reverse, a man on horseback with the Greek legend, above mentioned. The head of the bust helmeted, occurs too as a variety.”§

The large number of these coins proves that this king possessed an ample empire, and did not reign for a short time; he must have governed Cabul, and a part of the Punjab. The corrupt Greek suggests an era, more recent than that of many other Indo-Scythian coins. The title σωτήρ seems to connect him to the Greek Soter family, which may have concluded with Hermaios. This is the remark of Mr. Mueller, and I am only prevented from adopting it, because the Kadaphes coins are apparently still nearer related to one or the other Hermaios, and all the other Soters have likewise native legends. M. Raoul-Rochette|| accounts for the want of the name by (the supposed existence of) an agreement, with regard to the currency, to the effect, that in order to put the coins into common circulation in neighbouring states, the name of none of the kings of those states was

* A. T. V. p. 547.

† A. T. V. p. 547.

‡ R. R. I. p. 26. As. T. iv. 345.

§ R. R. I. No. 17. No. 18. No. 19. As. T. IV. pl. xxiii. No. 26 (Among the Azes' coins.)

|| II. 38.

used on the coins. The nameless king, however, appears to have been too powerful to acquiesce in such a stipulation. According to Mr. Mueller, his name, on account of its dissonance, could not be well expressed in Greek. People, however, who were not offended at the nominative βασιλευ, or the genitive βασιλευων, would not have hesitated at obtruding a name as barbarian as possible, on the Greek letters, and if the attempt were unsuccessful in Greek, why was not given recourse to native letters?

I cannot explain, why there is no name; but from the use of Greek characters alone, it becomes probable, that the Soter belonged to a certain Scythian horde, which had for some time their abode in a country, where purely Greek, and not native characters, were adopted for the coins. The nameless king, who perhaps first settled his horde in Cabul and about the Indus, perhaps adhered at first to the established custom by not adopting native characters on his coins. At an after period, however, he perhaps used them; if indeed the coins with native legends, which M. Mionnet assigns him, be really his.*

There exist besides, coins of some other Indo-Scythian kings, with regard to which it is doubtful whether they have native or purely Greek legends. They bear the title "King of Kings," and some of them have a horse, others an elephant, and they reigned therefore partly in Bactria, partly in India. As the names are illegible, we shall here only refer to the engravings and descriptions of these coins; for we must at first leave even this undecided, to which of these kings the native legends belong, and whether we have to adopt a separate series of Indo-Scythian kings, who admitted purely Greek letters and titles, whilst the Kanerki dynasty adhered to Greek characters to express barbarian words. If the assertion, that to the north of the Caucasus the characters on the coins were not used, be well founded, we might presume, that those Indo-Scythian kings held fixed dominion in Bactria alone. Now those coins yield no other historical result, than that the Indo-Scythians were divided into

* VIII. p. 505. pl. x. No. 85.

a number of dynasties, and that we are far from knowing the whole series of their names.*

Lastly, we have yet to mention here the king Mayes.

Type a Caduceus ; legend ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΜΑΥΟΥ. Reverse, the head of an elephant from which a bell hangs, of beautiful Grecian workmanship and with good Greek characters ; according to M. R. R., contemporary with Menandros and Apollodotos, as the same head of an elephant occurs on their coins ; his conjecture, that the name may be a variety of Apollodotos, has hardly any support whatever.† Mr. Mueller thinks these large copper coins to be the most ancient monuments of the Indo-Scythian dominion in India.‡ The elephant alludes indeed to a campaign against India. Being taken from the collections of the Generals Ventura and Allard, they refer to the Punjab. M. Mionnet ascribes to Mayes, moreover, a native legend, which consists of two signs.—This legend as given by Mr. Prinsep, is scarcely to be taken as letters ; M. R. R. has not noted it at all ; the pretended legend stands besides between βασιλέως and Μάου ; the name must have been expressed by ΡΛΟΥ, which does not appear with Mr. Mionnet. How then has this king used a native legend ? As respects this king also, I must leave it to numismatians to make a historical application.

§ 3. *Pure Greek characters ; barbarian names and words.*

Kodes. Small silver coins. A head, the hair wreathed with fillets, and descending to the neck ; it would appear, that the face is different (on different specimens) ; one has mustachoes, but all of them have suffered much. Legend, ΚΩΔΟΥ, complete on but one coin. § Reverse, a figure standing, the right hand lean-

* As. Trans. v. pl. xxxv. No. 4, iv. pl. xxi. No. 12. No. 13. No. 14. Then iv. pl. xxi. No. 7 and 8, lastly iv. pl. xxi. No. 11. Compare Mionnet viii. p. 504. No. 135, No. 136, No. 141, No. 142. I shall not undertake to read the native legends, represented x. No. 88.

† II. p. 49. The coins R. R. II. No. 18. As. Trans. iv. pl. xxv. No. 4. New varieties of them are discovered of late in the Punjab. As. Trans. vi. 987.

‡ 228.

§ As. Trans. v. pl. xlvi. No. 16, No. 17. No. 18. iv. pl. xxv. No. 11. No. 12. No. 13. R. R. J. d. S. 1834. No. 8. No. 9. p. 389.

ing on the hip, in the left a spear, indistinct head dress, flames behind the shoulders. Legend according to Mr. Prinsep's conjecture: (A)PΔHΘPOY MAKAP(OΣ). The Greek letters terminate in points; upon No. 13 there is perhaps the name of another god. A second variety, has the anterior half of a horse. They come from Cabul and western India; but likewise through Bokhara to Russia.

The horse refers to Bactria, as do the purely Greek characters and the god of fire, with whom the names of gods on the Kanerki coins are connected.

Kodes is perhaps the very same king, who went southwards over the Caucasus, and founded an empire on the banks of the Indus and of the Cabul, for the Kanerki.

Kanerki coins. I shall not repeat the remarks above made on the legends, the words PAO NANO PAO and KOPANO, and the names of gods. Kanerki is represented in a standing position, with a long Usbek coat, pointed Tartar cap, the right hand leaning on a spear (and a bow over the back, T. A. V. xxxvi b. 9.) with the left making an offering over an altar. The figures of gods on the reverse are already described. In the note I shall mention the coin,* some from the topes in Manikyala, Jellalabad, and from Cabul and the Punjab, from Benares, and likewise from the Ganges.†

Oerki. Bust of the king, adorned with a tiara, holding with the hand a plant which he contemplates.‡ The same places of discovery. No coins having Greek words, or the god of the sun.

A man mounted on an elephant; his name illegible, only PAO NANO PAO-KOPANO.§

On the coins of another king of this series, a female figure

* T. As. III. pl. XII. pl. XXV. IV. pl. LI. V. pl. XXXVI. Trans. R. As. Soc. I. pl. XII. R. R. J. des Sav. 1834. and I. pl. II. and the authorities. I. 57.

† As. Trans. III. p. 443. IV. p. 631. R. R. II. p. 4.

‡ As. Trans. III. pl. XXI. No. 2. XXII. No. 24. IV. pl. XXXVIII. No. 9. No. 7. V. pl. XXXVI. No. 3. No. 7. R. R. II. p. 58. J. des Sav. 1834. No. 10. As. Trans. III. p. 445.

§ A. T. III. pl. LI. No. 10. V. pl. XLVI. No. 13. No. 12. IV. pl. LI. No. 10. A. T. V. p. 722.

with a glory, seated on a couch ; one foot on the ground, the other, on the couch.* Here also the name is illegible.

There is another type of a figure sitting in a cross-legged position ; some other varieties may probably be still discovered.

The most ancient specimens of these coins have a tolerably good style, and distinct letters ; both become gradually worse, and lastly deteriorate into a chaos ; then follow the Indian imitations. The places of discovery prove, that the Kanerkis dynasty possessed, at least at the commencement of their rule, a large territorial dominion ; from the traces of the Shiva worship, we may conclude that the Kanerkis added to the worship of Mithra, introduced by them from Bactria, the worship of Shiva, as it occurred with the Kadaphises.† Hence they must (partly at least) have taken possession of the dominions of the Kadaphises. We may consider their dialect either as a more modern one, or as a provincial variety. It is evident from the coins, that they out-lastcd the Kadaphises, who never sunk into the same barbarism.

It will remain doubtful, whether the Kanerkis maintained themselves till within the Sassanian period, unless it be decided, that the topes must be ascribed indisputably to the Kanerkis. They certainly reigned in India before the time of the Sassanians. Lastly, the opinion, that the Kanerkis were Buddhists, or in other words, that we have to recognise Kanishka in Kanerki,

* A. T. III. pl. xxii. No. 29. iv. pl. 21. No. 9.

† The worship of Shiva appears to have prevailed in Cabul in the first centuries of our era, and beside it, pure Buddhism was widely diffused. Hiuan Tshang at least mentions a temple of Bhîmâ, viz. of Pârvatî or Doorga, in Gandhâra, p. 379. But Megasthenes appears to have already corrected this mistake. For if he reported, according to Arrian and Strabo, that the Indians of the plains worshipped Hercules (whereby Mathura is made mention of) and that the mountaineers, on the other hand, adored Dionysos, these latter must be probably understood to be the inhabitants of the mountainous districts about the Cabul, and below Kazmira, in the Punjab, while the plains are those of the inner country, and on the borders of the Jumna and Ganges. It is true, it has been of late doubted, whether Hercules be Krishna, but I hardly think, one acquainted with these subjects, will doubt it any more, than that Dionysos cannot be but Shiva:

must continue to be improbable, until Kanerki be also discovered on Buddhistic monuments.

II. *Greek, and Indian characters.*

The coins of Agathokles and Pantaleon alone as yet compose this class.

Agathokles. Diademed head of the king; reverse, a standing Jupiter, with the left hand leaning on his sceptre, holding on the right a small three headed Artemis, bearing a torch. Legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ.* Tetradrachma of very superior workmanship.

M. Raoul-Rochette has proved, that the figure on the legend is the Persian Artemis Hecate, the Ζαρήτις or Ζάρα, whose worship Artaxerxes Mnemon was endeavouring to propagate within his empire, and Bactria is especially mentioned† with regard to this. Male head, with Dionysos' crown of grapes. Reverse, a panther walking, holding with his fore claw a grape. The same legend as above mentioned. Tetradrachma.‡

Square copper coins with the same legend. On the obverse, a female Bacchanal, flourishing the thyrsus, and the legend above represented, in old Indian characters. Eleven specimens have been discovered, all from Cabul.§

M. Raoul-Rochette has tried by a vast display of learning to establish his conjecture, that Agathokles was the first king of Bactria, he having been the Eparch of Persia under Antiochus the second, who is called Pherekles by others, and whose pederasty is said to have excited the Parthian revolt.|| Not to mention other objections, this conjecture falls to nothing owing to the Indian letters, which Agathokles cannot have used for his Bactrian subjects. But previously to Euthydemus, no Bactrian king made conquests southwards from the Caucasus. As copper coins are less likely to go by trade into other countries than gold and silver (coins,) the place of discovery of the

* R. R. J. des Sav. 1834. p. 332. No. 2. II. No. I. p. 12 A. T. IV. pl. xxv. No. 3. from the Punjaub.)

† (J. des S. at other places, p. 340. II. p. 13.)

‡ (J. des S. No. 1. by the way of St. Petersburg.)

§ R. R. II No. I. II. p. II. A. T. V. pl. xxxv. No. 9.

|| (J. d. S. p. 336.)

Agathokles' coins points out an empire on the borders of the Cabul river.

The worship of the Persian Artemis must not appear surprising on the coin of a king, who, though not reigning in Bactria, yet started from that country. The Bacchanal symbols certainly allude to an Indian expedition; but it is surprising, that Agathokles and Pantaleon, almost coeval with him, should alone parade these symbols of Dionysos. Going a step further, we dare assert, that Agathokles reigned immediately over those districts, where the traces of the expedition of Dionysos were fancied to be extant; viz. over the country of the Nisaeans. But it is not India Proper, but Cabul, that is celebrated for her grapes; in Cabul too, are the copper coins of Agathokles discovered, and instead of the nation of the Nisaeans (a somewhat fabulous race) of Alexander's period, we observe in the late report of Ptolemy, the well defined town of Nagara, surnamed Dionysopolis, which denomination can have been only given by a Greek king, probably by Agathokles. His use of Indian, and not Cabulian characters, leads to the conclusion, that his reign succeeded a previous use of Indian characters; viz. it argues a former Indian domination in these districts. I therefore think he is the same, who first brought Grecian arms down the Cabul river. According to Mr. Mueller,* he reigned about the Upper Ganges. In this case he must before Menandros have advanced beyond the Hyphasis to the Jumna, and even further, which is at variance with Strabo's explicit statement. His coins, exhibiting a much better style in art than those of Menandros, he must have reigned before this king. Strabo would likewise mention him as the first, who crossed the Hyphasis.

Pantaleon. Square copper coins, exactly like those of Agathokles, before described as from Cabul and the Punjab.† Legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΠΑΝΤΑΛΕΟΝΤ(ΟΣ) and the other legend in Indian characters, above mentioned. From the small number of coins it becomes probable, that Pantaleon did reign but for a short time; the dominion, founded by Agathokles, must on the whole have been of short duration. We shall hereafter recur to this subject.

* p. 213.

† As. Trans. III. p. 168. v. p. 552.

III. Greek and Cabulian characters.

§ 1.—Greek Kings.

Eukratides. I assign to this place the coins bearing the title “Great King,” as they certainly mark an epoch in the life of the one Eukratides, even if they should not belong to a second of the same name. The Cabulian legend never occurs unaccompanied by the word ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ in the Greek legend; hence it follows, that the title, “Great King” was first adopted in the south of the Caucasus.

Helmeted head of the king. Reverse, the Dioscuri on horseback, with spears couched, holding branches of palms above the shoulders. Legend: ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΕΥΚΡΑΤΙΔΟΥ.*

The same with Greek legend on the obverse; on the reverse, *Mahārājō Eikatidō*.†

The same reverse with ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΕΥΚΡΑΤΙΔΟΥ, and on the reverse with the helmeted‡ or diademed § head of the king; no Cabulian legend.

Diademed head of the king; legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΕΥΚΡΑΤΙΔΟΥ. Reverse, caps of the Dioscuri with palms, of the native legend only *Maharajō*.||

According to Mr. Prinsep’s statement, ¶ the complete legend is מַהֲרַאֲיָוֹ רַאֲיָוֹ רַאֲיָוֹ *mahārājō rajā rājō Eikatidō*. This legend however appears only to occur upon one coin, on which the helmeted head of the king on the reverse has a female figure, seated, with the turret-like crown of the Cybele. ¶¶ The word is *rajā rājō*; it can hardly have occurred upon the other coins. As it cannot be, however, adopted by mere chance, we must ascribe the complete title to that as yet single coin alone. It is the only instance in which a Greek king of Bactria styles himself *king of kings*, and this only in Cabulian language, as it were, not venturing to obtrude this ostentatious title on his Greek subjects. Likewise Eukratides alone calls himself in

* J. des Sav. No. 5. As. Trans. IV. pl. xxv. No. 5.

† As. Trans. IV. pl. xxv. No. 8. 9. 10. R. R. I. No. 7.

‡ As. Trans. IV. pl. xxv. No. 7.

§ As. Trans. IV. pl. xxv. No. 6. R. R. I. No. 6. II. No. 3.

|| As. Trans. V. pl. XLVI. No. 11.

¶ As. Trans. IV. p. 338.

¶¶ According to the description. As. T. III. p. 164.

ted class, and Antimachos has strengthened his dominion by a victory at sea.

Philoxenos. Bust of the king; the bow of the diadem projecting from under the helmet. Legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΙΚΗΤΟΥ ΦΙΛΟΞΕΝΟΥ. Reverse, king on horseback galloping. Cabulian legend: *Mahârájô apalihatô pilashinô* (or *pilushino*).*

Demeter Karpoforos; in the right hand a crown; in the left a cornucopia; the foregoing Greek legend; reverse, the bull with the hump. The same Cabulian legend.†

The same obverse, with the reverse of a victory with crown and palm (only described).

M. Raoul-Rochette takes him for a king, who reigned in the neighbourhood of the Scythians, and valiantly fought against them on horseback. The Cabulian legend prevents us from acceding to this. Philoxenos wears a *kausia*, as Eukratides and Antimachos do, and as a horseman, moreover, is analagous with them. The bull with the hump is correctly interpreted as referring to a particular country, but to what country, will be evident from the coins of Azes. In Beghram no coins of Philoxenos have been discovered by Mr. Masson.

Archelios. Diademed head of the king. Legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ (ΔΙΚΑ)ΙΟΥ ΝΙΚΗΦΟΡΟΥ ΑΡΧΕΛΙΟΥ. Reverse, Jupiter, seated on a throne, the sceptre in the left hand, the thunderbolt in the right, and the legend, 𐎠𐎡𐎴𐎧𐎺𐎠 𐎧𐎡𐎴𐎧𐎺𐎠 𐎧𐎡𐎴𐎧𐎺𐎠, *maharajô, dhamikô, gajavatô Achilijô*. From Beghram.

I have given him this place, because the epithet "victorious" puts him into comparison with Antimachos; Antialkides, however, bears the same epithet, and has besides, the Jupiter.

Antialkides. Uncovered head of the king, with the branch of a palm, crossing the field. Legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΝΙΚΗΦΟΡΟΥ ΑΝΤΙΑΛΚΙΔΟΥ. Reverse, the Dioscuri caps with palms, as upon the coins of Eukratides. Legend, *maharajô gajavatô Atialikadô*.‡

* R. R. II. No. V. A. T. No. IV. pl. XXI. No. 1.

† R. R. II. No VI. As. T. IV. pl. XXI. No. 2.

‡ R. R. II. No. 7. I. No. 15. A. T. IV. pl. XXVI. No. 9. 10. 11.

M. Raoul-Rochette assigns to him with certainty a place immediately following Eukratides, in a neighbouring country, which we cannot, however, look for with him to the North of the Caucasus.* On account of the title Nikephoros, he has some analogy with Antimachos.

There exists another coin of this monarch with the head of the king, with the *kausia* and the same legend; the reverse represents Jupiter, seated on a throne, with a sceptre and a winged victory in his right hand. The same native legend.† All these coins are from Cabul or the neighbouring districts.‡

Lysias. Uncovered head of the king, the palm crossing the field as with Antialkides, the bust partly given. Legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΙΚΗΤΟΥ ΛΥΣΙΟΥ. Reverse, elephant.§ Legend, *Mahārājō apalihātō lisijō* (lisajō.)

M. R. R. pronounces him with full confidence successor of Antialkides;|| here likewise follow the titles *Aniketos* and *Nikephoros*, one after the other, as above mentioned, with Philoxenos and Antimachos. Coins of Lysias and of Antialkides are found in Cabul; ¶ the elephant alludes to an Indian expedition. The dynasty to which Antialkides and Lysias belonged, seems therefore in fact to have had their site in Cabul, and their empire was probably established upon the ruins of one more extensive.

I here insert a coin, for which I cannot discover a proper place.

Amyntas. Bust of the king with indistinct head-dress; legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΝΙΚΑΤΟΡΟΣ ΑΜΥΝΤΟΥ. Reverse, helmeted Minerva, with shield and lance, extending her right hand. Legend, *Maharajō, gajavatō amitō*. From the Punjab.¶¶

We now come to a longer series, bearing the title "deliverer."

Menandros. Helmeted head of the king with the upper part of the bust, and the chlamys; legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΥ. Reverse, Minerva *πρόμαχος*. R. R. I. No. 8. Legend, *Maharajō tādārō Minadhō*.

* II. p. 23. † As. Trans. V. pl. xxxv. No. 2. ‡ R. R. II. p. 22.

§ R. R. II. No. 18. As. Trans. IV. pl. xxvi. No. 12. || II. p. 24.

¶ R. R. II. p. 24.

¶¶ A. T. V. pl. xlvi. No. 1.

Helmeted head of the king, with the same Greek legend. Reverse, a clothed victory, with wings, palm, and crown. The same Cabulian legend.*

Head of an elephant, with the same Greek legend. Reverse, a club, with the Cabulian legend.†

Uncovered head of the king, with the upper part of the bust dressed in the chlamys; the right hand raised to throw a lance. The same Greek legend. Reverse, Thessalian Minerva, protecting herself with the shield; in the right hand the thunderbolt raised. The same Cabulian legend.‡

Head of the king in a helmet, and the Greek legend. Reverse, Ægis, and Cabulian legend.§

The same obverse; upon the reverse an owl, and the Cabulian legend.||

Obverse, wheel with eight spokes, and the Greek legend. Reverse, branch of a palm, and the Cabulian legend.

Uncovered head of the king, with the Greek legend; reverse head of an animal, which Mr. Prinsep, with probable correctness describes as an elephant, though Mr. Masson has drawn a dolphin. The same Cabulian legend.¶ Lastly, head of a boar, with the Greek legend. Reverse, branch of a palm surrounded by the native legend.**

Coins of Menandros have been frequently discovered in Beghram by Mr. Masson, so many even as one hundred and fifty-three specimens up to the year 1835; they are likewise met with in Agra, on the borders of the Jumna, and near Mathura.†† These were probably the extreme points of his empire. We have shown, that his reign extended to the Jumna, and the elephant on his coins corroborates this extent of his dominion. Whether he also ruled in Bactria, we shall hereafter inquire into; the native legends rather disprove than confirm this opinion.

* R. R. I. No. 9. 10. As. Trans. IV. pl. xxvi. No. 3.

† R. R. I. No. II. p. 17. As. Trans. IV. pl. xxvi. No. 2.

‡ R. R. II. No. 12. As. Trans. IV. pl. xxvi. No. 1.

§ As. Trans. V. pl. xlvi. No. 5.

|| At the same place, No. 6.

¶ At the same place, No. 8, as the preceding copper coin; according to M. R. R. II. 34. a club.

** At the same place, No. 9.

†† As. Trans v. p. 547. 722. Trans. of the R. A. S. I. 315.

For the historical arrangement of all those kings, it is of vital importance to ascertain the era of Menandros. M. Raoul-Rochette has most plausibly assigned to Menandros a later period than to Eukratides.* The inference he further draws from this position of Menandros, that he first took possession of the Indian empire of Demetrios, and afterwards of the Bactrian dominion of Eukratides, is hardly to be reconciled with the authorities of written history; we do not understand, in fact, how Menandros could dethrone Demetrios, since Eukratides had done it; we shall therefore hereafter lay hold of the only fact which is proved with probability by numismatic inquiry, viz. that Menandros seems to have reigned subsequently to Eukratides.

Apollodotos. Apollo standing, leaning his left hand on the bow, holding a lance with his right. Legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΟΤΟΥ. Reverse, a tripod: legend, *Maharajô Apaladatô tadarô.* †

Uncovered head of the king, with diadem and upper part of the bust, and the chlamys. Legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΦΙΛΟΠΑΤΟΡΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΟΤΟΥ. Reverse, Thessalian Minerva, as upon the coins of Menandros, covering herself with the Ægis instead of the shield. The same native legend, without *φιλοπάτωρ*, *tádârô* alone preceding the name. ‡ Elephant in motion. Legend as before mentioned: reverse, the humped bull, and the same native legend. §

The coins are discovered at the same places with those of Menandros, and M. Raoul-Rochette deserves the merit of having proved, with the utmost probability, that Apollodotus was the son of Menandros.

Diomedes. The Dioscuri, standing, and with lances. Legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ΔΙΟΜΗΔΟΥ. Reverse, the humped bull, and the native legend, which he probably thus restored:

* II. p. 32. 33.

† R. R. I. No. 12. As. Trans. IV. pl. xxvi. No. 6. No. 7. No. 8.

‡ R. R. II. No. 13. As. Trans. IV. pl. xxvi. No. 4.

§ R. R. II. No. 14. As. Trans. IV. pl. xxvi. No. 5. See. R. R. II. p. 18.

𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭮𐭠𐭮𐭠𐭮 (𐭠𐭮)𐭠𐭮 *Maharajó táddáró Dijamidó.** Only one specimen from Beghram. The humped bull, and the epithet, prove the right of position as here given.

Agathokleia. Helmeted head, which must be the head of a woman, with the upper part of the bust, and of the dress. Legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΑΣ ΘΕΟΠΡΟΠΙΟ(Υ) ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΙΑΣ. Reverse, Hercules seated, in the right hand the club, placed on his knee, with the left supporting himself, as on the coins of Euthydemos. Legend, *Maharajó táddáró Mikonidó.†*

Howsoever we may read the name, it is certain, that we have here a new king, whose epithet assigns him a place among the successors of Menandros. The place of discovery is not mentioned; the coin is, however, found in India. If any relation is to be admitted between Euthydemos and Agathokles, we may perhaps recognise another analogy in the fact, that Agathokleia exhibits a type of the Euthydemos' coins. She is certainly, however, the wife of the new king, mentioned only in this place; perhaps a heroine of masculine character, like Eurydike (the niece of Alexander, and grand-daughter of Philip), whom her husband honored by associating her with himself upon his coins. May not the unusual epithet perhaps allude to this fact? ‡

Hermaios. Uncovered diademed head of the king. Legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ΕΡΜΑΙΟΥ. Reverse, Olympian Jupiter, seated on his throne. Legend, *mahárájó táddáró, hirmajó.§*

Uncovered head of the king, with diadem, the upper part of the bust, and of the chlamys. Reverse, Olympian Jupiter seated, and extending his right hand. Legend as above described.||

Head of the king, probably with diadem, the same Greek legend; the reverse has a horse; and the native legend as above described.¶

* As. Trans. V. pl. xxv. No. 3. † As. Trans. V. pl. XLVI. No. 2.

‡ I find *θεύροπος* to be authorized by one passage alone in Heliodor. Carm. v. 250, as an epithet to *ζῆλος*. Only one Greek king of these provinces, Antimachos, has styled himself God.

§ R. R. I. No. 13 (where the initial letter in *tadaro* is misdrawn). As. Trans. IV. pl. xxiv. No. 1.

|| R. R. I. No. 14. p. 21. As. Trans. IV. pl. xxiv. No. 2. No. 3. No. 4.

¶ As. Trans. V. pl. xxxv. No. 11.

In Beghram so great a number of the coins of Hermaios have been discovered, that no doubt can be entertained of the seat of his empire. Mr. Masson thought he might adopt, according to the difference of the types, three different kings of this name, an opinion, rejected by M. Raoul-Rochette.* There is no doubt the coins, above described, with the bust, and the name of Hermaios on the obverse, and with Hercules, standing and leaning on the club and the curious native legends on the reverse,† do not belong to the Greek Hermaios himself, as in the Greek legend the name of Kadaphes is substituted for that of Hermaios, without any alteration of the type. Those only upon which ΖΑΘΟΥ occurs, have perhaps a title in another type; all the coins, however, that are published, are very indistinct.‡

As these coins prove that a Kadaphes took possession of the empire of Hermaios, so other facts concur in giving evidence, that Hermaios concluded the series of the Soter dynasty. His coins represent a rapid decline of art, and are partly excelled by those of the more ancient Indo-Scythians. M. R. R. has also here the merit of having proved, that the type of the Olympian Jupiter is an imitation of the coins of Alexander II. of Syria,§ and that Hermaios must have accordingly reigned after the years 129—23. B. C.

With Kadaphes, above mentioned, Kadphises is connected by name; but as previously to him, other Indo-Scythians must have ruled in the country on the borders of the Cabul, we shall first insert them here.

Barbarian Kings.

Azes. King on horseback, in his right hand a lance. Legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΑΖΟΥ. Reverse, Minerva, with the Ægis on her arm, in the left hand the lance, the right raised. Legend, *mahārājō rajārājō mahatō Ajō.*|| Or reverse, Minerva clothed, holding shield and spear in a moving

* As. Trans. III. p. 162. v. p. 547. R. R. II. p. 37.

† R. R. II. p. 36.

‡ As. Trans. V. pl. xxxv. No. 13. new coins of this class have been lately discovered, VI. 987.

§ I. p. 19.

|| R. R. II. No. 15. As. Trans. IV. pl. xxiii. No. 18.

position.* Or, reverse with a male figure in a tight tunic; tiara with ribbands hanging down, and bearing on the right hand a winged Victory. On both of them the same native legend, which is but seldom completely preserved.†

Or, the same obverse; reverse, a male figure, standing, with the tiara, and long stole, holding in the right hand an idol.‡ As far as traceable, the same native legend. Or, reverse with an Abundantia,§ standing and holding a cornucopia. Native legend, *maharajó*, *maható*, *dhamikó rajádirajó Ajó*. This complete legend is on the reverse not discernible.|| Obverse, Ceres, seated on a throne, in the left hand a cornucopia, the right raised; reverse, Hercules standing, and leaning on his club.¶ As far as legible, the simple native legend.

The following coins are of importance, as they mark the provinces, which were under Azes' dominion.

Obverse, the king on horseback. Reverse, the humped bull; on others, a Bactrian camel.** Obverse, elephant; reverse, the humped bull.††

Obverse, humped bull; reverse, lion without mane,‡‡ or Bactrian camel.§§ The Greek legend always the same, and the simple native legend ("without *dhamiko*") on some, *raja-rajó*; on others, *rajádirajó*.

Obverse, Neptune clad in the pallium, standing, with the left hand leaning on the trident, the right foot placed on the figure of a man, as if swimming. Reverse, a female figure in a long robe.||| M. R. R. has proved, that these symbols allude to

* R. R. II. p. 40. As. Trans. iii. pl. xi. 45. No. pl. xxiii. No. 15.

† R. R. II. No. 19. As. Trans. at the same place xxiii. No. 17, No. 19.

‡ R. R. II. No. 16. As. Trans. iv. pl. xxiii. No. 24. perhaps also No. 20. No. 21.

§ So in original. Goddess of Plenty.

|| R. R. II. p. 43. As. Trans. IV. pl. xxiii. No. 22. The legend v. p. 549.

¶ R. R. II. p. 45. As. Trans. iv. pl. xxii. No. 10. No. 11.

** R. R. II. p. 43. As. Trans. IV. pl. XXII. No. 9.

†† R. R. II. p. 44. As. Trans. IV. pl. XXII. No. 4, 5.

‡‡ At the same place No. 1, 2, 3.

§§ No. 6, 7, 8.

||| R. R. II. No. 17, As. Trans. IV. pl. XXIII. No. 14.

the Indus river, and to India conquered. Legends, as above described.

As now by these coins Azes lays claim to having conquered the Indus, so the four animals evidently point out the extent of his dominion. The Bactrian camel requires no interpretation, nor the maneless lion, which undoubtedly alludes to an Indian district, and though in our time the lion is only met with in Guzerat,* they must in Azes' time not have been confined to that province. I would rather presume, that by the adoption of the lion, the Sinha, the subduing of the lions among Indian men, viz. the Narasinha, Rajaputra was to be represented, therefore the subjugation of the warlike tribes in the modern Rajpootana, which moreover lies beyond† Guzerat. The Indus subjected, refers certainly to the districts towards its mouth, to Pattalene, which on the west is bounded by Guzerat. As now, the elephant likewise points to Indian provinces, a question arises as to what particular province this refers. It must of course allude to that part of India, which must have been likewise under Azes' dominion, viz. to the country to the north of Rajpootana, the Punjab; yet I confess, I know not why the elephant, which might obviously be used as an emblem for the whole of India, should be made to refer to this part of India alone. A glance

* Mr. Lassen is not aware, of how valuable an argument he has deprived himself in not having ascertained the existence of the lion in our days in Hurriana, where they were a few years ago plentiful; they are now more rare, being driven into the desert by sportsmen, and the gradual settlement of the country. Lions have been shot within the last fifteen years on the banks of the Chumbul, not more than fifty miles from Dholepore.



† I have already observed, that the lion even in our days is known to exist at no great distance from the Indus. It is perhaps worthy of remark in this place, that ample evidence is extant as to the great changes which must have taken place in the localities of wild animals in India, on the testimony of Baber, who mentions killing the rhinoceros on the banks of the Sind and Behreh. "There are numbers in the jungles of Pershawur and Hashhagar," according to Baber, (A. D. 1526), whereas in our own days that animal is not found to frequent any part of upper India above the Pillibheet forests in Rohilkhund; under these circumstances, it is hard to fix a location for the lion in the days of Azes.



at the map must give evidence, that Azes could not allude to any other country.*

It will be proved hereafter, that the Greek kings also, who have chosen the emblem of the elephant for their coins, must have especially referred to the Punjab.

If then the elephant and the lion allude to India, and if Azes also possessed Bactria, he cannot have typified by the humped bull any other country than that on the Cabul. This interpretation is also very well adapted to the other instances in which this symbol occurs; moreover, the Chinese mention the very same humped bull as an animal they for the first time met with in Kipin;† the names of Cabura (*gopura*, town of cows,) Kophen, and Koas, are perhaps allied to the name of the animal; on this point, however, the native orthography of these names alone can decide.

Azes, moreover, proclaims himself the possessor of so many provinces, upon those coins, where, besides the ordinary reverse of the king on horseback, the reverse exhibits a Victory,‡ having in the left hand a palm, in the right an indistinct effigy, probably bearing a trident. The native legend is *mahārājō rājarājō mahatō Ajilisō*. Of this hereafter.

We first mention the coins on which he is seen seated cross-legged, a sword across the knee, while the reverse has a four-armed male figure.§ I think, it certainly represents the Indian god Shiva. He had therefore adopted the Indian worship, as did after him Kadphises, and in some degree the Kanerkis. Azes was either also called *Azilises*, or this was the name of his son and successor. This fact is proved not only by the coins, already mentioned, but also by the following:

King on horseback, with lance depressed, and the Greek legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΑΖΙΑΙΣΟΥ.

* We have an excellent dissertation by Mr. Ritter, on the extreme boundary within which the lion is found in India, Erdkunde VI. p. 709, to which I willingly refer.

† Ritter, Erdkunde, VII. 684.

‡ R. R. I. No. 16.

§ As. Trans. IV. pl. XXII. No. 12, 13. R. R. II. p. 46.

Reverse, Victory with a palm in her left hand ; in the right a trident ; native legend, *Mahārājō rājārājō mahatō, Ajilisō*.*

The same obverse, with the reverse of the humped bull, and with the same legends.†

Azilises therefore claims Cabul and the country on the Indus to the sea, and if he were another king than Azes, as I think he was, he must have been his successor, on account of the exact correspondence in their coins.

It is, however, of far greater importance, to determine the period of those kings.

The coins of Azes are so closely connected with Greek types, that he must undoubtedly be a proximate successor of the Greek kings and their dominion.‡ Kadphises and the Kanerkis are at a greater distance. Kadaphes alone pretends to have conquered the empire of Hermaios ; and yet, this Kadaphes must have lived, according to the coins, at a later period than Azes. But if then Hermaios reigned about the year 120 B. C., Kadaphes must be of almost the same period ; Azes would be, on this supposition, an earlier successor to the other Grecian thrones ; he preceded Kadaphes therefore, and must be considered as a cotemporary of Hermaios. We shall hereafter state, to what conclusion the examination of the historic accounts must lead us. As to the matter in hand, M. Raoul-Rochette maintains, that the Minerva type of Azes was imitated after that of Vonones ; for as the titles and the monograms on the coins of both kings correspond with each other, Azes must be taken for the successor of Vonones.§

If I be allowed to object to the opinion of so solid as scholar, I venture the following remarks :—

First, the connexion between both of them being ascertained, why does it follow, that Vonones preceded Azes ? Certainly neither from the execution of the coins, nor from the historic accounts, would he do so. The Indo-Scythians decidedly reigned

* R. R. II. No. 20. As. Trans. IV. pl. XXIII. No. 27.

† At the same place, No. 28.

‡ R. R. II. p. 47, p. 41.

§ R. R. II. p. 30, 41.

on the Indus, previously to Vonones, even if he were the first of this name. Secondly, how can M. Raoul-Rochette reconcile the facts, that Azes was the immediate successor of the Greeks, and was still preceded by Vonones, obviously of Parthian origin. The monograms decide nothing as to the succession. Parthian kings, even Arsakes VI, had, a long time previously to Vonones, the title of "great king of kings." The epithet "just," assumed alike by Azes and Vonones (this escaped the notice of M. R. R.) also occurs much earlier in Parthian history, even in the time of Arsakes VII.* Why must Azes have borrowed these titles from Vonones? As Archelios among Greek kings already styled himself "just," why cannot Azes have adopted this title from him? Lastly, the Minerva type, upon which the whole argument is based, already occurs with Amyntas; why should it not have descended thence to Azes?

The Vonones under consideration, can hardly be the first of this name, and if M. Raoul-Rochette be right, we must assign Azes to a still later period. I think, however, I have proved, that we shall proceed with more certainty in determining Azes' place by historical accounts, independent of any connexion whatever with Vonones.

It is probable, that such an extensive empire as that of Azes, was not at once overthrown; thus we observe, besides those of Azilises, coins, apparently belonging to successors (of his dynasty); the emblems of the various provinces, however, viz. camel, humped bull, lion, and elephant, do not recur; hence we may conclude, that the successors were not powerful enough to maintain the whole empire.

Some of the coins above (see As. T. 1840, p. 645.) mentioned, perhaps, belong to this class; we would still add the following:

An equestrian coin with ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ; reverse, king holding a spear, with a Kaftan,† and *mahârdjô*. Azes never has this dress himself; a name is not traceable.

Another coin of a horseman, with illegible Greek legend, and the monogram of the Kadphises' coins. Reverse, two male

* Visconti. Iconogr. III. 76, 80.

† As. Trans. IV. pl. XXIII. No. 25.

figures crown the king, who stands between them, and leans on a club. On the native legend are only the initial letters of *Mahārājō* discernible, and of the name, 𑀮—𑀕𑀸; the three middle letters should be, according to Mr. Prinsep 𑀕𑀸𑀕; according to the coin, however, this is hardly clear.*

There is a third equestrian coin, on which a figure of indistinct shape delivers to the horseman a diadem. Greek legend effaced. On the reverse, according to Mr. Prinsep, a Caduceus; the name indistinguishable; we can only read *Mahārājō*.†

Of the following king, we know but the name of his brother; and even with this clue, his era has not been ascertained. It is Spaliryos, likewise represented as a horseman. The reverse seems to have been much disfigured; the well known type of Hercules seated. The legends are above described.‡

On account of the similarity of the name, we place after him Spalirisos, with Tartarian Kaftan, and a palm over his left shoulder. The reverse is apparently a disfigured form of Jupiter,§ seated, as occurring on the coins of Hermaios. This king appears to have reigned in Laghman, and perhaps also in some neighbouring districts.

As these last mentioned sovereigns still preserve the relics of Grecian art, so also Vonones, who belongs to this class as being a horseman.

The king on horseback, with depressed lance. Legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΟΝΩΝΟΥ. Reverse, Jupiter, clad in the pallium, leaning on the sceptre, in the right hand the thunderbolt.|| On the reverse, a Victory without wings, in the left hand a palm, in the right something indistinguish-

* As. Trans. V. pl. XXXV. No. 5. from the Punjab. The position of the horseman is quite the same with the Parthian Artaban III.

† As. Trans. V. pl. XXXV. No. 15. pl. XLVI. No. 14. V. XXXV. perhaps belongs too, to this king.

‡ See As. Trans. IV. pl. XXI. No. 9. V. pl. XXXV. No. 6. R. R. II. No. 9. From the Punjab and Beghram. R. R. II. p. 26. As. Trans. V. p. 551.

§ R. R. I. No. 21. As. Trans. V. pl. XXXV. No. 7. IV. pl. XXI. No. 7, six specimens from Manderor in Laghman. As. Trans. V. p. 551.

|| R. R. II. No. 10.

able.* The same Greek legend; the native one has been already mentioned.

Lastly, Hercules, the lion's skin in the left hand, the club on his arm, crowning himself with the right; reverse, Minerva, *νικηφόρος*, with a helmet; on her left hand the shield, and holding on her right hand a winged Victory.† According to the native legend, the word ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥ must have occurred here instead of ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ

I think I have already proved, that the name Vonones cannot have occurred in native characters on the reverse of these coins, but probably the name Volagases; and further, that this Vonones need not have been, according to the coins, a predecessor of Azes. On comparison with other Parthian coins, it is likewise evident, that Vonones, in striking coins for his Cabulian subjects, followed the coinage of Cabul, and not of the Parthians. To trace the period of Vonones from coins, purely Parthian, would therefore be fallacious.

Another fact to determine the era of Vonones offers itself in the following. The initial letter of the Parthian coin, above described, is M. The Roman Victory on this coin, renders it necessary to assign to this king a later period than to Vonones I. who first of the Arsacides adopted this type.‡ This also leads to Meherdates, who was educated in Rome, and the initials of the name are more like ME than MO; but this does not decide the question, whether it were Vonones the First or the Second.

As we have now to admit among the sovereigns of Cabul, not Greeks, but Parthians also, who probably reigned after Azes, (on this hereafter), so a dynasty succeeded the great Indo-Scythian, which assumed the Soter-title of the Greeks. As Azes does not bear this title, they are probably not his descendants.

First, a nameless king, a horseman like Azes, with the legend [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΩΝ (sic) CΩTH[P] the name is effaced. The reverse presents a male figure walking, with the left hand extended; in the right an elevated spear, with a pecu-

* R. R. II. No. 14. of the coin. As. Trans. IV. pl. XXI. No. 15. I do not venture to trace the reverse.

† R. R. II. p. 30. I. No. 20. As. Trans. IV. pl. XXI. No. 10.

‡ Visconti Iconogr. III. 146.

liar head-dress, the left shoulder naked, otherwise clad in a robe after the fashion of the Gods on the Kanerki-coins. Legend, $\text{מַהַטֹּוֹ תַדְחָרֹוֹ מַהַרַּאֲיֹוֹ}$, *mahatô tadharô maharajô*; the name is also here effaced.*

The monogram on this coin is now the very same with that of the nameless Soter-megas, and we must recognise here, if not himself, yet a near successor of his. The Greek characters do not allow us to connect this king, or the nameless Soter, with the Greeks.

This Scythian Soter dynasty, however, prove themselves as of the same period, or as directly succeeding, the Arsacides above-mentioned, by the following coins, namely by those of Yndopherres. Having the same title, the same Greek characters, and, besides, the Victory of the Arsacides, he is allied to them. He is a complete barbarian in comparison with Azes, and if Yndopherres indeed succeeded the Parthians, Azes may claim an earlier era. Yndopherres, however, endeavours to keep the Greek style of the stamp, while the Kadphises, about to be mentioned, has removed every trace of Grecian art, save the characters, on which he also obtrudes words of his language.

Kadphises. The king on a low seat, bearded, in a high Tartar cap in the form of a cylinder, from which flowing ribbands descend, in a Kaftan and Tartar boots, holding a branch in his hand. In the space below, a club. Reverse, Siva in a light dress, the left hand on the bull Nandi, in the right the trident. There occurs the complete native legend above described; the Greek is the short one.†

The king standing in the same dress, the left hand on his hip, holding the right over a small altar, above which, a trident; in the left space a club (or a sceptre) the long Greek legend; the reverse as above described.‡

Bust of the king, in the right hand sceptre or club; above the cap, the moon-formed sickle (of Siva); in the left a small

* As. Trans. IV. pl. XXIII. No. 23.

† R. R. Journal des Sav. No. VIII.

‡ Trans. of the R. A. S. I. No. 10. R. R. I. No. 23. p. 30. As. Trans. III. pl. XXVI. No. 4. No. 5. V. p. 547. From Balkh, from Beghram and Manyâla.

hammer, short Greek legend. Reverse, Ardhanari, holding in his right hand a long trident, in the left the discus and pasa of Siva; the complete native legend.* The same reverse; the bust facing the right.†

Lastly, the king on a carriage with two horses; over the shoulder the club, in no proportion with the charioteer; the short Greek legend. Reverse, Ardhanari with the native legend.‡

As copper coins of Kadphises are dug out even near Benares,§ he must have reigned from Beghram to a great distance in India Proper. The execution of these coins is indeed still Greek, but whenever the worship of Siva is represented, the types have become purely Indian. This worship first appears, though not frequently, with Azes, is exclusive with Kadphises, and is joined by the Kanerkis with Bactrian gods, who have the same monogram with Kadphises, and are found together with his coins.|| There is scarcely any doubt, that Kadphises was a near predecessor of the Kanerkis. His relation to Kadaphes is more obscure. It is clear, that Kadphises has some reference to him, save that the former is more ancient, because he is immediately connected with Hermaios. This king (or the last of his name) was limited to Beghram, and this must have been the principal seat of Kadaphes, though his dominions were of further extent. Now it is a singular fact, that according to the Chinese accounts, the ancient (Scythian) empire of Gandhara was situated in Kiapiche (Capissa), and therefore just beyond Beghram, while the native legend expresses the name Kadphises by Kapisa; this is accordingly the name of the country in the form of pronunciation delivered to the Greeks and Chinese, which name, however, appears to be an absorption from Kadphisa. If the name however be a geographical determination, a new enigma is given, and Uhavima must be understood in this case

* R. R. I. No. 22. From Cabul in a tope. R. R. I. 28. II. 4. 56. J. des Sav. p. 390.

† As. Trans. IV. pl. XXXVIII. 4, No. 2, 3.

‡ The same No. 1.

§ As. Trans. p. 631.

|| As. Trans. IV. 631.

as a proper name. But it is at variance with this supposition, that Kadaphes should bear the same name. Or is this perhaps a title, and the same case with the nameless *Sotermegas*.

It would be also desirable to ascertain in an approximative degree the relation of Kadphises to the Scythian Soter family. Yndopherres, like Kadphises, appears to have reigned in Beghram;* but the former is allied to the Parthians, the latter to the first Azes; the first has ruder coins, though a classic style; the second, types of a better, although of entirely Indian execution, with an assimilation to Azes by the Siva-worship, while his relation to Kadaphes places him nearer Hermaios; he appears therefore more ancient than Yndopherres. The only objection would be, that the latter in this case is thrown between Kadphises and Kanerki. If the equestrian coins allude, as I presume, to a more westerly country than Gandhara, the solution is perhaps given by the conjecture, that Yndopherres and the Soters, closely allied to him, reigned as horsemen in a more westerly direction than Kadphises and Kanerki; they might therefore rather be placed near either of them, than between them; but I willingly abandon this uncertain base of argument.

It will be proper to look out for firmer grounds upon which we may classify the many dynasties, above enumerated.

§ 15.

Greco-Bactrian Kings.

Let us turn now to the examination of the written accounts of the history of the Greeks in Bactria. Bactria continued under the dominion of the Seleucides to the period of Antiochus II. (262—247. B. C.) when Theodotus took advantage of the weak government, and probably of the wars of that monarch with Ptolemy II. to render himself independent. This separation of Bactria from the monarchy of Antiochus happened a short time before the declaration of independence by the Parthians, or previously to 256 B. C. as appears from the fact, that Arsaces,

* According to the number of coins, there discovered. As. Trans. V. p. 547.

the founder of the Parthian empire, had fled from the increasing power of Theodotus.*

We do not know how far the power of Theodotus extended. Sogdiana was perhaps subjected to him, but it is hardly credible that the thousand towns which Justin attributes to him, to show his power, really existed in his dominions. Bayer plausibly conjectures, that these thousand towns were erroneously transferred by Justin from a notice on Eukratides, to the founder of the Bactrian empire.† The passages show only that Theodotus contrived the conquest of Parthia, while the aggrandisement of the Bactrian power is ascribed to Euthydemus.

In opposition to the explicit authority of these authors, M. Raoul-Rochette has endeavoured to establish Agathokles as the founder of the Bactrian empire.‡ It is true, the eparch of Persia under Antiochus II. is called sometimes Agathokles, and sometimes Pherekles; but our Agathokles reigned in a province of India, and previously to Euthydemus the Bactrian dominion did not extend so far southward.

* Prolog. Trog. Pomp. XLI. "In Bactrianis autem rebus, ut a Diudoto rege constitutum imperium est." Just. xli. 4. On Arsaces: "Non magno deinde post tempore Hyrcanorum quoque regnum occupavit, atque ita duarum civitatum imperio præditus, grandem exercitum parat, metu Seleuci et Theodoti, Bactrianorum regis. Sed cito morte Theodoti metu liberatus, cum filio ejus et ipso Theodoto fœdus ac pacem fecit. Strabo xi. c. 2. p. 515 "Νεωτερισθέντων δὲ τῶν ἔξω τοῦ Ταύρου διὰ τὸ πρὸς ἀλλήλους εἶναι τοὺς τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς Μηδίας βασιλέας, τοὺς ἔχοντας καὶ ταῦτα, πρῶτον μὲν τὴν Βακτριανὴν ἀπέστησαν οἱ πεπιστευμένοι, καὶ τὴν ἐγγὺς αὐτῆς πᾶσαν οἱ περὶ Εὐθύδημον." § 3. p. 515. on Arsaces, "οἱ δὲ Βακτριανὸν λέγουσιν αὐτόν. φεύγοντα δὲ τὴν αὐξήσιν τῶν περὶ Διόδοτον, ἀποστῆσαι τὴν Παρθυαίαν.

But there was no long interval between both insurrections. Justin, xii. 4, fixes the defection of the Parthians as under the consulate of L. Manlius Vulso, and M. Atilius Regulus; "eodem tempore etiam Theodotus, mille urbium Bactrianarum præfectus, defecit, regemque se appellari jussit. Quod exemplum sequuti, totius orientis populi a Macedonibus defecere." But who were they, unless the Parthians?

† p. 47.

‡ J. des Sav. 1834. p. 334.

There have not yet been discovered coins of Theodotus and his son of the same name, and they can only come from Bactria.

Whether another king reigned between Theodotus II. and Euthydemus, is unknown, but not improbable; the one fact is certain, that the latter sovereign dethroned the family of Theodotus, for he alleged this very act in order to obtain the favour of Antiochus III.*

Upon Strabo's authority, above mentioned, Euthydemus took possession of the districts adjacent to Bactria; Parthia cannot be understood by this, he must have meant Aria and Margiana; he had at least collected against Antiochus an army of horsemen on the borders of the Arius,† and had already fought against the northern nomades, he must have, therefore, certainly possessed Sogdiana, and to him probably refers the notice, that the Greek kings of Bactria divided their empire into Satrapies.‡

We owe to the expedition of Antiochus against upper Asia, a clearer insight into the circumstances of those countries at that period. This war, and the negotiations between the Syrian and the Bactrian kings belong to the years 208-5. B. C. From Polybios' account, which is extant, it follows, that the Parthian

* Polyb. Fragm. xi, c. 34. Schw. III. p. 379. γεγονέναι γὰρ οὐκ αὐτὸς ἀποστάτης τοῦ βασιλέως, ἀλλ' ἐτέρων ἀποστάντων, ἐπανελόμενος τοὺς ἐκείνων ἐκγόνους, οὕτω κρατῆσαι τῆς Βακτριανῶν ἀρχῆς

† Polyb. x. 49.

‡ Strabo, xi. 11, 2. οἱ δὲ κατασχόντες αὐτὴν Ἕλληνες, καὶ εἰς σατραπείας διηρήκασιν· ὧν τὴν τε Ἀσπιώνου καὶ τὴν Τουριοῦαν ἀφῆρηντο Ἐυκρατίδαν οἱ Παρθναῖοι. Ἔσχον δὲ καὶ τὴν Σογδιανὴν κ. τ. λ. The two satrapies mentioned, evidently lie toward the northerly Scythian country, the frontier of Sogdiana. The Ἀσπασιά-και (Strabo, xi. Scyth. 8.) to whom Arsaces fled, belonged to the Chorasmians and Attasians, who have likewise the name Ἀυγάσιοι; perhaps we ought to read Ἀσπάσιοι. Polyb. (x. 48.) calls all Nomades about the Oxus *Aspasiaces*, which is therefore a general term for the nations of horsemen (*Azpa*, horse). Mr. Burnouf undoubtedly explains with propriety Turiana by the word of the Zend Tûirja; it is the Turan of Firdusis; the Turanian satrapy of Bactria, according to Strabo.

empire, at that period, was still limited to Hyrcania and Parthia, and the Scythian nomades to their northerly heaths, though even menacing invasion. Among the conditions of peace occurred likewise the following stipulation,—that Euthydemos was to surrender his elephants; hence we may presume, that although he had made no expedition on the south beyond the Caucasus, yet, he must have entered upon connexions with India. At that time he had not yet a firm footing southward of the mountains, as we find there the king Sophagasenos, who concluded an alliance with Antiochus, delivered over to him some elephants, and agreed to pay him a certain sum of money. The Indian king apparently engaged in this league as a protection from Euthydemos, whose power had already manifested itself in the south of the Caucasus. As it is called a renewed treaty, this Indian king must have belonged to the dynasty of the Palibothrian princes, who had always been in friendly relations to the Seleucides. We can indeed prove hereafter, that from the time of Seleukos Nikator, those Indian kings possessed the country west of the Indus to the Caucasus,* and hence it arises, that the Bactrian kings, down to the time of this peace, had no possessions in the south of the Caucasus, and only when Antiochus entangled himself in disputes with Egypt, and thereby with Rome, were they at liberty to engage in plans for an invasion of India; that is therefore about the year 203 B. C.

Antiochus effected his retreat through Arachosia and Drangiana, and there is no reason to doubt, that both countries were still under the dominion of the Seleucides.†

Demetrios, the son of Euthydemos, then a youth of remarkable beauty, had a principal share in concluding the peace with Antiochus, whose daughter was given him in marriage.

This Demetrios however is afterwards not mentioned as king of Bactria, but of India (“Demetrii regis Indorum”‡)

* De Pentap. Ind. p. 42—45.

† By the notice, that Seleukos had also yielded Arachosia to Kandragupta, we have certainly to understand but the district eastward of the sources of the Helmund and the Lora.

‡ Justin. xli. 6.

fighting with Eukratides for the dominion of Bactria, and eventually conquered and deprived of India by this king. We do not know, whether he originally succeeded his father in Bactria, and was expelled from thence, and limited to his Indian possessions, being eventually deprived of them also, or whether some one embraced the opportunity of his absence from Bactria, while he was perhaps engaged in an expedition against India, after the death of his father, to take possession of the Bactrian throne.* Nor do we know, whether Eukratides or a predecessor of his, expelled the family of Euthydemus from Bactria.

The opinion which most naturally suggests itself is, that Eukratides expelled them; up to this time, however, Menandros has been ordinarily considered as king of Bactria before Eukratides, though some say, Apollodotos, probably the son of Menandros, or, lastly, Heliokles, whom we know only from the coins. The opinions maintained as explanatory of these different successions to the throne of Bactria, must exceedingly differ one from another, on account of our defective information; and were we to examine these opinions, it would be evident, that all of them are more or less artificial and forced, and even dogmatical. But instead of subjecting them to a critical review, it will suffice our purpose to refer (Bayer, p. 85—89. R. R. I. 34. II. 33,) to them, and to attempt arranging the facts in the way in which, from our own comparison of the respective passages, and the new results derived from the coins, we think we must needs consider them.

First; the conjecture of adopting three kings in Bactria between Euthydemus and Eukratides, appears somewhat improbable. Menandros is among them, whose reign cannot have been a short one, since we know that he had made great conquests in India, and gained by his justice the general attachment of his

* M. R. R. infers from the coins, that Demetrios, although for a short time, did also reign in Bactria. This conjecture is not improbable, though the conclusion of R. R. does not appear to me to be founded on a firm basis.

subjects. On this fact we have the authority of Plutarch and Strabo.*

Secondly ; the respective passages, more carefully considered, do not render it necessary to consider Menandros as a king of Bactria, but they are rather at variance with this view.

Plutarch makes no mention of Menandros but accidentally; and the great conqueror is so little known to him, that he calls him, "*one Menandros.*" As now even Strabo, though he had before him the book of Apollodoros of Artemita, the very best authority for this history, does not distinguish in a remarkable manner the separated dominions of the Greeks in India, a fact fully established by the evidence of the coins ; we cannot be surprised, that Plutarch in later days, confounded the separate Indian empire with the Bactrian one. The expression he uses, does not therefore oblige us to consider Menandros as king of Bactria.

Strabo, when summing up in his passage the greatest extent of power on the whole, any where attained by those Greeks who rendered Bactria independent, mentions Menandros as the sovereign who advanced farthest towards India ; but he is not named there as king of Bactria, nor does this follow from a passage conceived in such general terms as this is. If we do not explain this passage as intended to give a general view, but rather limit the facts mentioned to Menandros and Demetrios, they would be considered by Strabo as those that stirred up Bactria against the Seleucides, and who had also possessions in the country of the Scythian nomades ; now the first statement would be false, and the second improbable.

Lastly ; the following passage, (Prolo. Trog. Pomp. xli) "*Indicæ quoque res additæ, gestæ per Apollodotum et Menandrum, reges eorum. Bactria* was, it is true, already mentioned, but why should this prevent a suspicion, that in such an extract the expression was too concisely given, and that instead of explaining "*eorum*" by "*Bactrianorum,*" we should not rather supply "*Indorum*" from "*Indicæ ?*"

* Plutarch de Rep. Ger. p. 821.

Μενάνδρου δέ τις ἐν Βάκτροις ἐπιεικῶς βασιλεύσαντος, εἴτα ἀποθανόντος ἐπὶ στρατοπέδου κ. τ. λ.

Strabo. xi. p. 516. We shall hereafter examine this passage.

I infer from this discussion, that none of the passages cited necessitate our considering Menandros as a Bactrian king, and still less Apollodotos. It is only certain, that Menandros made great conquests in India; we must therefore have recourse to the coins.

Thirdly; these coins always exhibit Cabulian letters as their symbols, and their places of discovery, moreover, refer to an Indian empire, and we may justly assign Menandros and Apollodotos to the history of the Indo-Grecian kingdoms.*

Now as to Heliokles:—

This king, mentioned by no author, must have his place assigned him on numismatological grounds alone; but different conclusions have been drawn from them by different writers. Visconti, and M. Raoul-Rochette think him earlier than Eukratides; in this case he might be the very same who removed the Euthydemides from the throne, and the epithet, “the just,” might allude to his retributive justice towards the family of the usurper Euthydemus. M. Mionnet takes him for the successor, and even for the murderer, of his father Eukratides. In this case he was perhaps the last Greco-Bactrian king. The numismaticians may settle this dispute among them. There is ample room for him, as well before as after Eukratides, if even *two* Eukratides be adopted.†

* See Mr. Mueller, p. 208.

† Visconti. Icon. III. p. 253. R. R. II. p. 20. p. 26. Mionnet VIII. p. 470. M. R. R. concedes (p. 20) that Heliokles was coeval with his Eukratides II.; but supposing now, that there were *two* Eukratides, or say even, there were only one, how can Heliokles, who has no claim whatever to having possessed any empire save Bactria, have been coeval with Eukratides, unless he were his immediate predecessor or successor? The numismatological reason for assigning to Heliokles an earlier era, seems not to be very evident, as M. R. R. does not mention any certain fact. Visconti's inference, drawn from the epithet, is wholly inconclusive. But how can we reconcile, that in vol. II. p. 20, M. R. R. should make Heliokles a contemporary of Eukratides, while in vol. I. p. 33, he is considered the successor of Demetrius, predecessor of Antimachos, and pre-predecessor of Eukratides I? M. Mionnet explained the epithet of Heliokles, by the passage of Justin, in which he prides himself on the murder of his father as of a good deed. If he were indeed the son and successor of Eukratides, this interpretation of

However Demetrius may have been deprived of the Bactrian throne, it is established, that he founded an Indian empire; thence attacking Eukratides in Bactria, he was conquered by this king, who then took possession of India also.*

Let us first settle where we have to look for the empire of Demetrius. Strabo, in the passage where he takes a general view of the conquests of the Greek kings, mentions two of them, Demetrios and Menandros, as the greatest conquerors. These conquests included partly Ariana, by which Strabo means the country of the Paropamisades, Arachosia, and Gedrosia; and partly countries to the north of Sogdiana. The mention of the Serians does not lead us to *China*, as has been objected to that reading, but to the *Issedon Serica* of Ptolemy, on the borders of the Achardus, whether it be Yarkiang or Kaschgar, and where indeed is the improbability of this supposition? This is the construction of the geographer, Dionysios (p. 752,) *Καὶ Τόχαροι, Φρούγοι τε, καὶ ἔθνεα βάρβαρα Σηρῶν.*" These conquests lastly included districts towards India, and this in two directions, in India Proper, beyond the last river reached by Alexander, beyond the Hyphasis to the Jumna, and down the Indus to the sea, comprising the Delta of Pattalene, and further to the east Surastra or Guzerate, extending along the shore.†

the epithet would be most acceptable, were it not wholly preposterous; for M. R. R. says, (II. p. 20.), "Cette idée est si extraordinaire, qu'elle ne comporte pas une discussion sérieuse. Jamais en aucun temps et dans aucun pays du monde on n'a bravé l'opinion publique, ni outragé la raison et l'humanité au point de prétendre couvrir un parricide par le titre *Juste*." I however will not venture "tantas componere lites." It affords me extreme pleasure to learn, that the science of Numismatics is the only one which does not submit to force, and pay homage to crime, that it has even necessitated such an abominable monster as the son and murderer of Eukratides to preserve upon his coins, that respect for public opinion, which he elsewhere so boldly violated!

* Justin. xli, 6. Strabo xi. 1, p. 516.

† Τοσοῦτον δὲ ἰσχυσαν οἱ ἀποστήσαντες Ἕλληνες αὐτὴν (Bactria) διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν τῆς χώρας, ὥστε τῆς Ἀριανῆς ἐπεκράτουν, καὶ τῶν Ἰνδῶν, ὡς φησιν ὁ Ἀπολλόδωρος ὁ Ἀρταμιτηνὸς, καὶ πλείω ἔθνη κατεστρέψαντο ἢ Ἀλέξανδρος, καὶ μάλιστα Μέ-

I infer from this discussion, that none of the passages cited necessitate our considering Menandros as a Bactrian king, and still less Apollodotos. It is only certain, that Menandros made great conquests in India; we must therefore have recourse to the coins.

Thirdly; these coins always exhibit Cabulian letters as their symbols, and their places of discovery, moreover, refer to an Indian empire, and we may justly assign Menandros and Apollodotos to the history of the Indo-Grecian kingdoms.*

Now as to Heliokles:—

This king, mentioned by no author, must have his place assigned him on numismatological grounds alone; but different conclusions have been drawn from them by different writers. Visconti, and M. Raoul-Rochette think him earlier than Eukratides; in this case he might be the very same who removed the Euthydemides from the throne, and the epithet, “the just,” might allude to his retributive justice towards the family of the usurper Euthydemus. M. Mionnet takes him for the successor, and even for the murderer, of his father Eukratides. In this case he was perhaps the last Greco-Bactrian king. The numismaticians may settle this dispute among them. There is ample room for him, as well before as after Eukratides, if even *two* Eukratides be adopted. †

* See Mr. Mueller, p. 208.

† Visconti. *Icon.* III. p. 253. *R. R.* II. p. 20. p. 26. Mionnet VIII. p. 470. *M. R. R.* concedes (p. 20) that Heliokles was coeval with his Eukratides II.; but supposing now, that there were *two* Eukratides, or say even, there were only one, how can Heliokles, who has no claim whatever to having possessed any empire save Bactria, have been coeval with Eukratides, unless he were his immediate predecessor or successor? The numismatological reason for assigning to Heliokles an earlier era, seems not to be very evident, as *M. R. R.* does not mention any certain fact. Visconti's inference, drawn from the epithet, is wholly inconclusive. But how can we reconcile, that in vol. II. p. 20, *M. R. R.* should make Heliokles a contemporary of Eukratides, while in vol. I. p. 33, he is considered the successor of Demetrius, predecessor of Antimachos, and pre-predecessor of Eukratides I? M. Mionnet explained the epithet of Heliokles, by the passage of Justin, in which he prides himself on the murder of his father as of a good deed. If he were indeed the son and successor of Eukratides, this interpretation of